

DEPARTMENT OF STATE 100001-0487
WASHINGTON



July 12, 1946.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE A/CDC/MR

REVIEWED BY Jack DATE 3/18/81
RDS or XDS EXT. DATE
TS AUTH. 100001-0487
ENDORSE EXISTING ☐
DECLASSIFIED ☒
RELEASE DENIED ☐
PA or FOI EXEMPTIONS

SECRET

MEMORANDUM FOR THE FILES

From: S. Klaus

Subject: JIOA Meeting, July 12, 1946.

A meeting was held of the JIOA Governing Committee and of JIS at the office of JIS this morning. There was present a Colonel Ford whose precise role was not explained to me. The subjects for discussion were the two papers which I had approved only on condition that the State Department's past work be included. This was the paper on the replies as to Austria and the paper for SWNCC on the inadequacy of the immigration program. Colonel Booth stated that the Department had no objection to the papers if they presented not only the military point of view which they now embody, but also the State Department's point of view which they did not embody. Captain Abbott of the Navy, who seems to have been the chief drafting officer, argued that the State Department had no real place in the JIS or the JIC or with the JCS because JCS was a military organization and the State Department's position was only that of an adviser. I told him in that case we were wasting our time and that our time had been wasted because these papers had been sent down to JIOA for State Department concurrence a number of times, and it appeared to me that when the answer which came was not satisfactory to Captain Abbott our work was disregarded and the case presented to JCS for SWNCC just as though we hadn't done anything at all on the subject. I pointed out that this was stultifying to me, to Mr. Langer, who had a position equivalent to an Assistant Secretary, as well as to Colonel Booth. I said that I would not see what purpose there was in concealing facts from the JCS or SWNCC. I pointed out again that the Austrian question was not

one

DECLASSIFIED 0488

one of military prerogative but one of international law as to which the State Department was the final authority. Abbott's only response to that was that the State Department should give its opinions to SWNCC but he finally gave up when I pointed out again that he had been wasting our time by asking State Department opinion if either he was not entitled to have it or disregarded it when he didn't like it. I told him that the State Department was being asked to concur in these documents and that being the case he ^{had} assumed that we had an interest. It was finally agreed that Booth and I would rewrite the Austrian paper to include our view but without the conclusion of appendices.

With respect to the denial paper, I made the same points as the foregoing but specifically with respect to the program. Booth and I reiterated that the whole denial purpose could be effected immediately by an expansion of the PAPERCLIP program. The only objection heard was that the PAPERCLIP program was based on voluntary agreement of the German specialists and that wives and children might not easily be brought in under it. I took occasion to dwell on the security dangers of the Immigration program and answered the assertion (of Wev) that we were imposing stricter security requirements in this case than in ordinary cases. I called attention to the Argentine development and to the VDI investigation report from Berlin. I pointed out then, and earlier in the meeting, that the Immigration program was not long-term but short-term since the Germans, once in the United States, could leave immediately without control for Russia, Argentina, or another country; whereas, the military custody program was really a long-term control program. I also pointed out that nobody seemed to want real exploitation here but only denial; for the Air Corps was offering only a three-month contract and the Navy and the Army offered no contracts at all so far. As to the willingness of Germans to come here, I said that this was a practical matter which should be handled by military men on a military basis, such as rations improvement, salaries, etc. Colonel Cranford agreed with me completely and pointed out that the defaults had been on the side of G-2 which had failed to take care of the Germans in Germany properly (leading to complaints of the specialists in Wright Field that their relatives were not being properly treated in Germany), and CIC had not sent in reports although they had been requested over a long period, and frequently.

It was

DECLASSIFIED

-3-

After the meeting, at Booth's request, I dictated an insert for the Austrian paper and made other changes to take care of my objections.

SA-L:SKlausur:ltm

.....